



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

|                      |   |                           |                       |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Applicant</b>     | Borrego Water District                      | <b>County</b>             | San Diego & Riverside |
| <b>Project Title</b> | Anza Borrego Desert Planning Grant Proposal | <b>Grant Request</b>      | \$ 841,779            |
|                      |   | <b>Total Project Cost</b> | \$ 1,256,062          |

**Project Description** The Proposal will prepare a useful and meaningful IRWM Plan for the Region, and complete planning studies that will address the Region's key issues as well as support development of a standards-compliant IRWM Plan.

### Evaluation Summary

| Scoring Criterion   | Score       |
|---------------------|-------------|
| Work Plan           | 9           |
| DAC Involvement     | 6           |
| Schedule            | 5           |
| Budget              | 6           |
| Program Preferences | 3.5         |
| Tie Breaker         | 0           |
| <b>Total Score</b>  | <b>29.5</b> |

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. While the Applicant explains current circumstances and priority issues for the region, the Proposal lacks documentation supporting how the Plan will comply with the following five IRWM Plan standards: a) Integration, b) Project Review Process, c) Impacts and Benefits, d) Finance, and e) Coordination. Although Table 3-2 cites the Work Plan tasks that address each of the standards; the tasks, as described, do not always support the table reference. The use of a catchall phrase in Task 3.6 assumes all unmentioned standards will be covered in Task 3.6 is insufficient in supporting that a standards compliant plan will result from the planned work. In addition, it is not clear how the stakeholders will provide input directly to the RWMG when they appear to have separate meetings (Tasks 1-2.1 and 1-2.2).
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. While the application states that the region meets the disadvantaged definition, the proposal seems to lack long term engagement of DACs in the planning effort. Subtask 1-1.2 "Increase and Sustain Involvement from DACs and Tribal Entities" explains that targeted outreach by phone and email will notify DACs and Tribes of meetings, and that up to four meetings will be held in DAC or tribal areas to identify major water related issues. Sub-task 1-1.2 notes that "These meetings will result in the development of text that will be incorporated into the IRWM Plan to characterize DAC and tribal communities and their water management needs." In addition, the consultant will work with those representing DACs (although these representatives were not identified) within the region to develop project scopes, budgets, and cost estimates for identified DAC projects to insert into the IRWM Plan. These efforts do not adequately demonstrate how the region will facilitate and support sustained DAC participation in the IRWM planning process.
- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by well-presented documentation. The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, and the time frames appear reasonable.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. The Budget states in all categories that the hourly costs are inflated to include all costs for producing deliverables, without



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012*

---

supporting documentation to demonstrate the basis for the estimate. The consultant team includes both a Project Manager and a Project Planner, without any explanation as to the duties associated with the roles, making it difficult to ascertain if the costs are reasonable.

- **Program Preference** The Proposal sufficiently demonstrates that 7 of the 15 preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.